SB 1268 Truan

DIGEST:

This bill allowed the Willacy County Hospital District to raise the current tax for maintenance and operation and the care of indigents from .04¢ per \$100 valuation to .08¢ per \$100. This tax would be submitted to the voters by the Board of Directors of the hospital district and must be approved by a majority of the electorate.

REASONS FOR VETO: This bill as originally introduced would have required the election to be held by the commissioners court, not the Board of Directors of the hospital district. Also, the tax would have to be approved by 2/3 of the voters instead of a simple majority. These major changes in the legislation were not the intent of the Board of Directors of the hospital district.

REACTION:

The Board of Directors of the hospital district did not express any opposition to the changes made concerning the manner of the election. The fairest way to decide any election, whether it deals with taxes or not, is by simple majority vote.

SB 1273 Mengden

DIGEST:

This bill allows a general law city with a population of 1250 or more to annex a municipal utility district under certain circumstances. It would allow the City of Shoreacres (near La Porte) to annex the Bay Municipal Utility District.

REASONS FOR VETO: Most of the people in the unincorporated area are "absolutely against" the bill. They want to be annexed by La Porte rather than Shoreacres.

REACTION:

Governor Clements has no business getting involved in a local squabble. This was totally and completely a local bill for one senatorial district; it didn't affect anyone else in the state. There was sufficient protection in the bill to protect the residents in the unincorporated area if a majority of them didn't want to be annexed.

The Governor says he vetoed the bill because "most of the people in the area are absolutely against" it. How does the Governor, rather than the Senator from the area, know what a majority of the people in a senatorial district want? Ironically, the problem which prompted the bill was solved in the judicial branch the day the bill was vetoed.